arXiv:1612.07603v1 [cs.NE] 21 Dec 2016

Difficulty Adjustable and Scalable Constrained Multi-objective Test Problem Toolkit

Zhun Fan, *Senior Member, IEEE,* Wenji Li, Xinye Cai, Hui Li, Kaiwen Hu, Qingfu Zhang, *Fellow, IEEE,* Kalyanmoy Deb, *Fellow, IEEE,* and Erik D. Goodman

***Abstract*—In order to better understand the advantages and disadvantages of a constrained multi-objective evolutionary algorithm (CMOEA), it is important to understand the nature of difficulty of a constrained multi-objective optimization problem (CMOP) that the CMOEA is going to deal with. A CMOP includes objectives and constraints, and a number of features, such as the multi-modality and the degeneracy of a Pareto front, have already been extracted to define the difficulty of objectives. However, an explicit and precise definition of difficulty of constraints in CMOPs is still lacking, which makes it difficult to evaluate the performance of CMOEAs tested on them. In this paper, we first propose three primary types of difficulty to characterize the constraints in CMOPs, including feasibility-hardness, convergence-hardness and diversity-hardness. We then develop a general toolkit to construct difficulty adjustable CMOPs with three types of parameterized constraint functions according to the proposed three primary types of difficulty. In fact, combination of the three primary constraint functions with different parameters can lead to construct a large variety of CMOPs and CMaOPs, whose difficulty can be uniquely defined by a triplet with each of its parameter specifying the level of each primary difficulty type respectively. Based on this toolkit, we suggest fifteen difficulty adjustable CMOPs named DAC-MOP1-15 with different types and levels of difficulty. To study the effectiveness of DAC-MOP1-15, two popular CMOEAs - MOEA/D-CDP and NSGA-II-CDP are adopted to test their performances on them. Furthermore, this toolkit also has the ability to scale the number of objectives. Nine difficulty adjustable constrained many-objective optimization problems (DAC-MaOPs) named DAC-MaOP1-9 with the scalability to the number of objectives are also proposed using this toolkit. Two constrained many-objective evolutionary algorithms (CMaOEAs) - CNSGA-III and CMOEA/DD are applied to test their performances on three, five, seven and ten-objective DAC-MaOP1-9 with different difficulty levels and types.**

***Index Terms*—Constrained problems, multi-objective optimization, test problems, controlled difficulties.**

I. Introduction

PRACTICAL optimization problems usually involve simultaneous optimization of multiple and conflicting objectives with many constraints. Without loss of generality, constrained multi-objective optimization problems (CMOPs) can be defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize} \quad & \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}) = (f_1(\mathbf{x}), \ldots, f_m(\mathbf{x}))^T \\ \text{subject to} \quad & g_i(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0, i = 1, \ldots, q \\ & h_j(\mathbf{x}) = 0, j = 1, \ldots, p \\ & \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}) = (f_1(\mathbf{x}), f_2(\mathbf{x}), \ldots, f_m(\mathbf{x}))^T \in \mathbb{R}^m$ is a m-dimensional objective vector, $g_i(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ defines i-th of q inequality constraints, $h_j(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ defines j-th of q equality constraints. If m is greater than three, we usually call it a constrained many-objective optimization problem (CMaOP).

A solution $\mathbf{x}$ is said to be feasible if it meets $g_i(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0, i = 1, \ldots, q$ and $h_j(\mathbf{x}) = 0, j = 1, \ldots, p$ at the same time. For two feasible solutions $\mathbf{x}^1$ and $\mathbf{x}^2$, solution $\mathbf{x}^1$ is said to dominate $\mathbf{x}^2$ if $f_i(\mathbf{x}^1) \leq f_i(\mathbf{x}^2)$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ and $f_j(\mathbf{x}^1) < f_j(\mathbf{x}^2)$ for at least one $j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$, denoted as $\mathbf{x}^1 \preceq \mathbf{x}^2$. For a feasible solution $\mathbf{x}^* \in \mathbb{R}^n$, if there is no other feasible solution $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ dominating $\mathbf{x}^*$, $\mathbf{x}^*$ is said to be a feasible Pareto-optimal solution. The set of all the feasible Pareto-optimal solutions is called Pareto Set (PS). Mapping the PS into the objective space results in a set of objective vectors, denoted as the Pareto Front (PF), where $PF = \{\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^m | \mathbf{x} \in PS\}$.

For CMOPs, more than one objective need to be optimized simultaneously subject to constraints. Generally speaking, CMOPs are much more difficult to solve than their unconstrained counterparts - unconstrained multi-objective optimization problems (MOPs). Constrained multi-objective evolutionary algorithms (CMOEAs) are particularly designed to solve CMOPs, with the capability of balancing the search between the feasible and infeasible regions in the search space [1]. In fact, two basic issues need to be considered carefully when designing a CMOEA. One is to balance the feasible solutions with worse objective values and the infeasible solutions with better objective values, the other is to balance the convergence and diversity of a CMOEA.

To address the former issue, constraint handling mechanisms need to be carefully designed by researchers. The existing constraint handling methods can be broadly classified into five different types, including feasibility maintenance, use of penalty functions, separation of constraint violation and objective values, multi-objective constraint handling and hybrid methods [2]. The feasibility maintenance methods usually adopt special encoding and decoding techniques to guarantee that a newly generated solution is feasible. The penalty functions based method is one of the most popular approaches. The overall constraints violation is added to the objective functions with predefined penalty factors which indicate a preference between the constraint functions and the objective functions. The penalty functions based method includes static penalties [3], dynamic penalties [4], death penalty functions [3], co-evolutionary penalty functions [5], adaptive penalty functions [6]–[8] and self-adaptive penalty functions [9], [10] etc. In the methods using separation of constraint violation and objective values, the constraint functions and the objective functions are treated separately. Variants of this type include

stochastic ranking (SR) [11], constraint dominance principle (CDP) [12], epsilon-constrained methods [13], [14]. In the multi-objective constraint handling method, the constraint functions are transformed to have one extra objective function. Representative methods of this type include infeasibility driven evolutionary algorithm (IDEA) [15], COMOGA [16] and Cai and Wang's Method (CW) [17], etc. The hybrid methods of constraint handling usually adopt several constraint handling method. Representative methods include adaptive tradeoff model (ATM) [18] and ensemble of constraint handling methods (ECHM) [19].

To address the second issue, the selection methods need to be designed to balance the performance of convergence and diversity in MOEAs. At present, MOEAs can be generally classified into three categories based on the selection strategies. They are Pareto-dominance (e.g., NSGA-II [20], PAES-II [21] and SPEA-II [22]), decomposition-based (e.g., MOEA/D [23], MOEA/D-DE [24], MOEA/D-M2M [25] and EAG-MOEA/D [26]) and indicator based methods (e.g., IBEA [27], R2-IBEA [28], SMS-EMOA [29] and HypE [30]). In the group of Pareto-dominance based methods, such as NSGA-II [20], the set of the first non-dominated level solutions is selected to improve the performance of convergence, and the crowding distance is adopted to maintain the performance of diversity. In the decomposition-based methods, the performance of convergence is maintained by minimizing the aggregation functions and the performance of diversity is assured by setting the weight vectors uniformly. In the indicator based methods, such as HypE [30], the performance of convergence and diversity is obtained by the hypervolume metric.

A CMOP includes objectives and constraints, and a number of features have already been concluded to define the difficulty of objectives. The first feature is that objectives have the ability to change the geometry of PF and PS of a MOP. The geometry of PF of a MOP can be linear, convex, concave, degenerate, disconnected and mixed of the former. Representative MOPs with this feature include ZDT [31], F1-9 [32] and DTLZ [33]. Some MOPs, such as MOP1-7 [34] and IMB1-14 [35] have the biased or imbalanced search space, which means the favored PF is relatively easy to find and the corresponding favored PS dominates most of the feasible search space. The objectives of a MOP can be either uni-modal (DTLZ1 [33]) or multi-modal (F8 [32]). Objectives with multi-modal have multiple local optimal solutions which increase the likelihood of an algorithm trapping in the local optimal. The high dimensionalities of variable space and objective space are also critical features to define the difficulty of objectives. LSMOP1-9 [36] have the high dimensionalities of variable space, and DTLZ [33] and WFG [37] have the high dimensionalities of objective space.

In fact, constraint functions greatly increase the difficulty of the optimization problems. As far as we know, only several test suites (CTP [38], CF [39]) are designed for CMOPs.

CTP test problems [38] are able to adjust the difficulty of the constraint functions. They offer two types of difficulties: the difficulty near the Pareto front and the difficulty in the entire search space. The test problem CTP1 gives an optimizer the difficulty near the Pareto front, because the constraint functions of CTP1 make the search region close to the Pareto front infeasible. Test problems CTP2-CTP8 provide an optimizer the difficulty in the entire search space. The constraint functions of CTP2-CTP8 have six parameters ($\theta, a, b, c, d,$ and e). Parameter θ controls the slope of the Pareto front. Parameter a has an effect of making the transition from continuous to discontinuous feasible region far away from the Pareto front. Parameter b controls the number of disconnected regions. Parameter c controls the distribution of the disconnected regions. The discrete segments of Pareto front can be non-uniformly distributed by using $c \neq 1$ to control the distribution. If $c > 1$, more Pareto solutions are located toward right. If $c < 1$, more Pareto solutions go toward left. Parameter d decides the width of the feasible regions. The difficulties of CTP2-CTP8 are significantly affected by the parameter d. Parameter e shifts the constraints up or down in the objective space. The Pareto fronts of them lie on the line: $(f_2(x) - e)\cos\theta = f_1(x)\sin\theta$.

Deb et al.'s CTP test problems [38], [40] offers the above-mentioned advantages, which we have used in constructing our test problems. But, they have some limitations:

- The number of decision vectors in the constraint functions can not be adjusted.
- No constraint functions with low ratios of feasible regions are suggested.
- The number of objectives is not scalable.

CF test problems [39] are also commonly used benchmarks, and they also have two types of difficulties which are similar to those of CTP test problems [38]. For CF1-CF3 and CF8-CF10, their PFs are a part of their unconstrained PFs. The rest of CF test problems CF4-CF7 have difficulties near their PFs, and many constrained Pareto optimal points lie on some boundaries of the constraints. Although the CF test problems offer some advantages, they also have some limitations:

- The number of decision variables in the constraint functions can not be extended.
- The ratio of feasible regions is relatively high.
- The number of objectives is not scalable.

Most EMO literature uses standard two-objective test problems, such as BNH [41], TNK [42], SRN [43], OSY [44] problems, which are not scalable and it is difficult to ascertain the type of difficulties these problems provide. In this paper, we propose a general framework to construct difficulty controllable and scalable CMOPs which can overcome the limitations of existing CMOPs. Constraints constructed by this toolkit can be classified into three major types. They are feasibility-hard, convergence-hard and diversity-hard CMOPs. Feasibility-hard CMOP is a type of problem that presents a great difficulty for various CMOEAs to find feasible solutions in the search space. CMOPs with feasibility-hardness usually have low portions of feasible regions in the entire search space. In addition, CMOPs with convergence-hardness mainly suggest difficulty for CMOEAs to approach the PFs efficiently by setting many obstacles before them. On the contrary, CMOPs with diversity-hardness mainly provide difficulty for CMOEAs to distribute their solutions along the complete PFs of them. In our work, the three types of difficulty are embedded into the CMOPs through proper construction of constraint functions.

In summary, the contribution of this paper is as follows:

1) This paper defines three primary types of difficulty for constraints in CMOPs. When designing new constraint handling mechanisms for a CMOEA, one has to investigate the nature of constraints in a CMOP that the CMOEA is aiming to solve, including the difficulty types of constraints. In return, to verify the performance of a CMOEA designed already, comprehensive experimental studies can be conducted if a test suite of CMOPs with different difficulty types of constraints is available. Therefore, a proper definition on the types of difficulty for constraints in CMOPs is necessary and desirable.
2) This paper defines the levels of difficulty for constraints in CMOPs, and the difficulty levels of constraints are adjustable. They are uniquely defined by a triplet with each of its parameter specifying the level of each primary difficulty type respectively. Combination of the three primary constraint functions with different difficulty triplets can lead to construct of a large variety of constraints for CMOPs.
3) Based on the proposed three primary types of difficulty for constraints, fifteen difficulty adjustable CMOPs (DAC-MOPs) named DAC-MOP1-15 have been constructed. To demonstrate the scalability to the number of objectives in CMOPs, nine difficulty adjustable CMaOPs (DAC-MaOPs) named DAC-MaOP1-9 with the scalability to the number of objectives have also been suggested.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II discusses the effects of constraints on PFs. Section III introduces difficulty types and levels of constraints in CMOPs. Section IV explains the proposed toolkit of construction methods for generating constraints in CMOPs with different types and levels of difficulty. Section V realizes the scalability to the number of objectives in CMOPs using the proposed toolkit. Section VI generates a set of difficulty adjustable CMOPs using the proposed toolkit to construct the constraints. In Section VII, the performance of two CMOEAs on DAC-MOP1-15 and two CMaOEAs on DAC-MaOP1-9 with different difficulty levels are compared by experimental studies, and Section VIII concludes the paper.

II. Effects of constraints on PFs

Constraints define the infeasible regions in the search space, leading to different types and levels of difficulty for the resulting CMOPs. Some major effects of the constraints on PFs in CMOPs include the following [45]:

1) Infeasibility makes the original unconstrained PF partially feasible. This can be further divided into two situations. In the first situation, the PF of the constrained problem consists of a part of its unconstrained PF and a set of solutions on some boundaries of constraints, as shown in Fig. 1(a). In the second situation, the PF of the constrained problem is only a part of its unconstrained PF, as shown in Fig. 1(b).
2) Infeasibility comes on the way of converging to the PF, as shown in Fig. 1(c), so algorithms will not have a smooth way to approach the PF.
3) The complete original PF is no more feasible and every constrained Pareto optimal point lies on some constraint boundaries, as shown in Fig. 1(d). There could be various structural variations here. For example, the unconstrained PF can be of convex type, but the constrained PF is non-convex. Thus, by the time an algorithm converges close to the constrained PF, non-dominated points take a convex shape, but as the algorithm approaches the constraint boundary, they have to take a non-convex shape. This may provide difficulties to some CMOEAs.
4) Constraints may reduce the dimensionality of the PF, as shown in Fig. 1(e). Although the problem is $M-$dimensional, constraints make the constrained PF $K-$dimensional (where $K < M$). Some of the constrained DTLZ problems (DTLZ8-9) are of this type.

III. Difficulty types and levels of constraints in CMOPs

Three primary difficulty types of constraints are identified as convergence-hardness, diversity-hardness, and feasibility-hardness. A difficulty level for each primary difficulty type can be defined as a parameter ranging from 0 to 1. Three difficulty levels, corresponding to three primary difficulty types respectively, form a triplet that depicts the nature of the difficulty of constraints in a CMOP. The triplet can be used to construct constraints in a CMOP with an arbitrary difficulty type by combining three parameterized constraint functions.

A. Difficulty 1: Diversity-hardness

For constraints with diversity-hardness, achieving the complete PFs of CMOPs is difficult. Generally, the PFs of CMOPs with diversity-hardness constraints have a number of discrete segments, or the diversity-hardness constraints make the search space imbalanced, which means that some parts of the PFs are more difficult to be achieved than other parts.

B. Difficulty 2: Feasibility-hardness

For constraints with feasibility-hardness, the ratios of feasible regions in the search space are usually very low. It is difficult to generate a feasible solution for a CMOEA on the feasibility-hard CMOPs, and in the initial stage of a CMOEA, most solutions in the population are infeasible.

C. Difficulty 3: Convergence-hardness

CMOPs with convergence-hard constraints hinder the convergence of CMOEAs to their PFs. Infeasibility comes on the way of converging to the PFs, so CMOEAs will not have a smooth way to approach the PFs. In other words, the generational distance (GD) [46] metric, which indicates the performance of convergence, is difficult to be minimized in the evolutionary process.

D. Difficulty level of each primary difficulty type

A difficulty level of each primary difficulty type can be defined by a parameter in the parameterized constraints corresponding to the primary difficulty type. Each parameter is normalized from 0 to 1. Three parameters, corresponding to the difficulty level of the three primary difficulty types



Fig. 1. Illustration of the constraint effect on Pareto fronts. (a) Infeasibility makes the original unconstrained PF partially feasible, and many constraint Pareto optimal points lie on some constraint boundaries. (b) Infeasibility makes the original unconstrained PF partially feasible, and the constrained PF is a part of its unconstrained PF. (c) Infeasibility comes on the way of converging to the PF, and the constrained PF is same to its unconstrained PF. (d) Complete original PF is no more feasible, and every constraint Pareto optimal point lies on some constraint boundaries. (e) Constraints reduce the dimensionality of the PF. A two-objective optimization problem is transformed into a constrained single optimization problem.

respectively, form a triplet (η, ζ, γ) that exactly defines the nature of difficulty of a CMOP constructed by the three parameterized constraint functions.

If each element of the triplet can only take value of either 0 or 1, then a simple combination of the three primary difficulty types will give rise to seven basic different difficulty types. This is analogous to a simple combination of three primary colors will give rise to seven basic colors. But if we allow the three elements to take any value between 0 and 1, then we can literally get countless difficulty types (analogous to countless colors in the color space). A difficulty type here is then precisely depicted by a triplet (η, ζ, γ).



Fig. 2. The illustration of three primary difficulty types and their combination towards seven basic difficulty types (as shown in Table I), using an analogy of three primary colors and their combination towards seven basic colors

Fig. 3. The illustration of combining three parameterized constraint functions using a triplet composing of three parameters. The three primary constraint functions correspond to the three primary difficulty types respectively.

IV. Construction Toolkit

A CMOP consists of objectives and constraints. In terms of constructing objectives, Li, *et al.* [47] suggested a general framework. It is stated as follows:

$$f_i(\mathbf{x}) = \alpha_i(x_{1:m-1}) + \beta_i(x_{1:m-1}, x_{m:n}) \tag{2}$$

where $x_{1:m-1} = (x_1, \ldots, x_{m-1})^T$ and $x_{m:n} = (x_m, \ldots, x_n)^T$ are two sub-vectors of $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)^T$. $\alpha_i(x_{1:m-1})$ represents a shape function, and $\beta_i(x_{1:m-1}, x_{m:n})$ is called a nonnegative distance function. The objective $f_i(x), i = 1, \ldots, m$ is the sum of $\alpha_i(x_{1:m-1})$ and $\beta_i(x_{1:m-1}, x_{m:n})$.

In terms of constructing the constraints, three different types of constraints are suggested, corresponding to the proposed three primary types of difficulty of CMOPs. More specifically, Type-I constraints correspond to the difficulty of diversity-hardness, Type-II constraints introduce the difficulty of feasibility-hardness and Type-III constraints generate the difficulty of convergence-hardness. The detailed definition of the three types of constraints are listed as follows:

A. Type-I Constraints: Diversity-hardness

Type-I constraints are defined to limit the sub-vector $x_{1:m-1}$, and they limit the range of the shape functions. More specifically, this type of constraints divide the PF of a CMOP into a number of disconnected segments, thus it generates the difficulty of diversity-hardness. Here, we use a parameter η to represent the degree of difficulty, which ranges from 0 to 1. $\eta = 0$ means the constraints impose no effects to the CMOP, while $\eta = 1$ means the constraint function provides severe constraints.

In order to further illustrate the difficulty level of Type-I constraints in CMOPs, an example of CMOP is suggested as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \text{minimize} & f_1(x) = x_1 + g(x) \\ \text{minimize} & f_2(x) = 1 - x_1^2 + g(x) \\ & g(x) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} (x_i - sin(0.5\pi x_1))^2 \\ \text{subject to} & c(x) = sin(a\pi x_1) - b \geq 0 \\ & x_i \in [0, 1] \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

where $a > 0$, $b \in [0, 1]$, and $a = 10$, $n = 2$ are set here. The parameter η indicating the degree of difficulty is set to $\eta = b$. The number of disconnected segments in the PF is controlled

TABLE I
BASIC DIFFICULTY TYPES OF THE CMOPS

Basic Difficulty Types	Comment
T1: Diversity-hardness	Obtaining the complete PF is difficult
T2: Feasibility-hardness	Obtaining a feasible solutions is difficult
T3: Convergence-hardness	Obtaining a Pareto optimal solution is difficult
T4: Diversity-hardness and feasibility-hardness	Obtaining a feasible solution and the complete PF is difficult
T5: Diversity-hardness and convergence-hardness	Obtaining a Pareto optimal solution and the complete PF is difficult
T6: Feasibility-hardness and convergence-hardness	Obtaining a feasible solution and a Pareto optimal solution is difficult
T7: Diversity-hardness, feasibility-hardness and convergence-hardness	It is difficult to converge to feasible regions with diversity

by a. Moreover, the value of b controls the width of each segment. The width of segments reaches its maximum when $b = 0$. When b increases, the width of segments decreases, and the difficulty level increases, so does the parameter of difficulty level η, which is equal to b in this case. Therefore if η is set to 0.1, the PF is shown in Fig. 4(a). If $\eta = 0.5$, the PF is shown in Fig.4 (b). It can be observed that the width of segments of the PF is reduced as η keeps increasing. If $\eta = 1.0$, the width of segments shrinks to zero as shown in Fig. 4(c), which provides the biggest level of difficulty to the CMOP. The PF of a three-objective CMOP with Type-I constraints is shown in Fig. 4(d), and the difficult level $\eta = 0.5$. It can be seen that Type-I constraints can be applied into more than two-objective CMOPs, which means that a CMOP with the scalability to the number of objectives can be constructed using this type of constraints.

B. Type-II Constraints: Feasibility-hardness

Type-II constraints are set to limit the function of $\beta_i(x_{1:m-1}, x_{m:n})$, and it controls the ratio of feasible regions. Thus, Type-II constraints generate the difficulty of feasibility-hardness. CMOPs with feasibility-hardness can be constructed using this type of constraints. Here, we use a parameter ζ to represent the degree of difficulty, which ranges from 0 to 1. $\zeta = 0$ means the constraints are the easiest, and $\zeta = 1$ means the constraints are the most hard.

For example, a CMOP with Type-II constraints can be defined as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \text{minimize} & f_1(x) = x_1 + g(x) \\ \text{minimize} & f_2(x) = 1 - x_1^2 + g(x) \\ & g(x) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} (x_i - sin(0.5\pi x_1))^2 \\ \text{subject to} & c_1(x) = g(x) - a \geq 0 \\ & c_2(x) = b - g(x) \geq 0 \\ & n = 30, x_i \in [0, 1] \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

where ζ equals to $\frac{1}{2}\lg(\frac{1}{b-a})$, and $a \geq 0$, $b \geq 0$ and $b \geq a$. It is worth noting that the ratio of feasible regions is controlled by a and b. If $b-a = 1$, $\zeta = 0$, the feasible area reaches maximum as shown in Fig. 5(a). If $b - a = 0.1$, $\zeta = 0.5$, the feasible area is increased as shown in Fig. 5(b). If $b - a = 0.01$, $\zeta = 1$, the feasible area in the objective space is very small. The PF of this problem is shown in Fig. 5(c). Type-II constraints can be also applied to CMOPs with three objectives as shown in Fig. 5(d).

C. Type-III Constraints: Convergence-hardness

Type-III constraints limit the range of each component of objectives, and they come on the way of converging to the PFs, so CMOEAs will not have a smooth way to approach the PFs. Thus, Type-III constraints generate the difficulty of convergence-hardness. Here, we use a parameter γ to represent the degree of difficulty, which ranges from 0 to 1. $\gamma = 0$ means the constraints are the easiest, $\gamma = 1$ means the constraints are the most difficult, and the difficulty level increases as γ increases.

For example, a CMOP with Type-III constraints can be defined as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \text{minimize} & f_1(x) = x_1 + g(x) \\ \text{minimize} & f_2(x) = 1 - x_1^2 + g(x) \\ \text{where} & g(x) = \sum_{i=2}^{n} (x_i - sin(0.5\pi x_1))^2 \\ \text{subject to} & c_k(x) = ((f_1 - p_k)cos\theta - (f_2 - q_k)sin\theta)^2/a^2 \\ & +((f_1 - p_k)sin\theta + (f_2 - q_k)cos\theta)^2/b^2 \geq r \\ & p = [0, 1, 0, 1, 2, 0, 1, 2, 3] \\ & q = [1.5, 0.5, 2.5, 1.5, 0.5, 3.5, 2.5, 1.5, 0.5] \\ & a^2 = 0.1, b^2 = 0.4, r = 1.0, \theta = -0.25\pi \\ & c = 20, n = 30, x_j \in [0, 1], k = 1, \ldots, 9 \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

where the degree of difficulty parameter γ is defined as $\gamma = 0.5r$. If $\gamma = 0.1$, the PF is shown in Fig. 6(a). If $\gamma = 0.5$, the infeasible regions are increased as shown in Fig. 6(b). If $\gamma = 0.75$, the infeasible regions become bigger than that of $\gamma = 0.5$ as shown in Fig. 6(c). The constraints of Type-III can be also applied to CMOPs with three objectives as shown in Fig. 6(d). It is worthwhile to point out that using this approach we can further extend the number of objectives to be more than three, even though more sophisticated visualization approach is needed to show the resulting CMOPs in the objective space.

The three types of constraint functions discussed above correspond to three primary difficulty types of CMOPs respectively. In particular, Type-I constraint function corresponds to diversity-hardness, Type-II corresponds to feasibility-hardness, and Type-III corresponds to convergence-hardness. The level of each primary difficulty type can be decided by a parameter. In this work, three parameters are defined in a triplet (η, ζ, γ), which specifies a particular difficulty type. This approach of construction toolkit for CMOPs can also be scaled to generate CMOPs with more than three objectives. The scalability to the number of objectives is discussed in Section V.



Fig. 4. Illustrations on the influence of Type-I constraint. When the parameter of difficulty level η increases, the width of segments in the PF decreases, and the difficulty level of a CMOP increases. Because the PF of a CMOP with Type-I constraint is disconnect and usually has many discrete segments, obtaining the complete PF is difficult. Thus a CMOP with Type-I constraints is diversity-hard. (a) $\eta = 0.1$. (b) $\eta = 0.5$. (c) $\eta = 1.0$. (d) The Type-I constraint can be applied into three-objective optimization problems, and $\eta = 0.5$.



Fig. 5. Illustrations on the influence of Type-II constraint. The parameter of difficulty degree $\zeta = \frac{1}{2}\lg(\frac{1}{b-a})$. The ratio of feasible regions is controlled by ζ. When the parameter ζ increases, the portion of feasible regions decreases, and the difficulty level of feasibility increases. (a) $\zeta = 0.0$. (b) $\zeta = 0.5$. (c) $\zeta = 1.0$. (d) The Type-II constraint can be applied into three-objective optimization problems, and $\zeta = 0.5$.



Fig. 6. Illustrations on the influence of Type-III constraint. Infeasibility comes on the way of converging to the PF, and it is convergence-hard. The gray parts of each figure are infeasible regions. A parameter γ is adopted to represent the degree of difficulty, which ranges from 0 to 1. $\gamma = 0$ means the constraints are the easiest, and $\gamma = 1$ means the constraints are the most difficult. When $\gamma = 0.1$ increases, the difficulty level with convergence-hard of a CMOP increases. (a) $\gamma = 0.1$. (b) $\gamma = 0.5$. (c) $\gamma = 0.75$. (d) The Type-III constraint can be applied into three-objective optimization problems, and $\gamma = 0.5$.

V. Scalability to the number of objectives in CMOPs

Recently many-objective optimization attracts a lot of research interests, which make the feature of scalability to the number of objectives of CMOPs more important in current situation. A general framework to construct difficulty adjustable CMaOPs (DAC-MaOPs) with scalability to the number of objectives is listed in (6).

In (6), the objectives is same to the WFG toolkit [37], which has the ability to scale to any number of objectives. In terms of constraints, the first K constraints are defined to limit the ranges of parameters in the shape functions. The $(K+1)-th$ constraint is to limit the distance function, which has the ability to control the portion of feasible regions. The last $P+1$ constraints are set on the components of the objective functions, which generate a number of infeasible obstacles near its PF. Two parameters K and P define the total number of constraints. The difficulty level of DAC-MaOPs is controlled by a difficulty triplet (η, ζ, γ) which ranges from 0 to 1. η is used to adjust the difficulty level of diversity-hardness. ζ is adopted to tune the difficulty level of feasibility-hardness. γ is used to control the difficulty level of convergence-hardness. The difficulty level of a DAC-MaOP increases when each of parameter in the difficult triplet increases, and these three parameters are independent with each other. The detailed

definition of DAC-MaOPs is listed as follows:

$$
\begin{cases}
\text{Given} & \mathbf{z} = \{z_1, \ldots, z_t, z_{t+1}, \ldots, z_n\} \\
\text{Minimize} & f_{m=1:M}(\mathbf{x}) = Dx_M + S_m h_m(x_{1:M-1}) \\
\text{where} & \mathbf{x} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_M\} \\
& = \{\max(t_M^q, A_1)(t_1^q - 0.5) + 0.5, \ldots, \\
& \max(t_M^q, A_{M-1})(t_{M-1}^q - 0.5) + 0.5, t_M^q\} \\
& \mathbf{t}^q = \{t_1^q, \ldots, t_M^q\} \leftarrow \mathbf{t}^{q-1} \leftarrow \ldots \leftarrow \mathbf{t}^1 \\
& \mathbf{t}^1 \leftarrow \mathbf{z}_{[0,1]}, \mathbf{z}_{[0,1]} = \{z_{1,[0,1]}, \ldots, z_{n,[0,1]}\} \\
& = \{z_1/z_{1,max}, \ldots, z_n/z_{n,max}\} \\
\text{subject to} & c_k(\mathbf{x}) = sin(a\pi x_k) - b \geq 0, \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \\
& c_k(\mathbf{x}) = cos(a\pi x_k) - b \geq 0, \text{if } k \text{ is even} \\
& c_{K+1}(\mathbf{x}) = (e - x_M)(x_M - d) \geq 0 \\
& c_{K+p+1}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1, j\neq p}^{M} (f_j(x)/S_j)^2 \\
& +(f_p(x)/S_p - 1)^2 - r^2 \geq 0 \\
& c_{K+P+2}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^{M} (f_j(\mathbf{x})/S_j - \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}})^2 \\
& -r^2 \geq 0 \\
& a = 20, d = 0.5, n = 30 \\
& k = 1, \ldots, K, \text{and } K \leq M - 1 \\
& p = 1, \ldots, P, \text{and } P \leq M \\
& b = \eta, \text{if } \eta = 0,\ c_{1:K}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \\
& e - d = 10^{-2\zeta}, \text{if } \zeta = 0,\ c_{K+1}(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \\
& r = 0.5 * \gamma, \text{if } \gamma = 0,\ c_{K+2:K+P+2}(\mathbf{x}) = 0
\end{cases} \tag{6}
$$

where M is the number of objectives, $\mathbf{z}$ is a decision vector, and its dimension is $t + l = n \geq M$. The domain of $z_i \in \mathbf{z}$ is $[0, z_{i,max}]$, and for each $z_{i,max} > 0$. The first t and the last l components are position- and distance-related decision variables respectively. $\mathbf{x}$ is a set of M underlying parameters. x_M and $x_{1:M-1}$ are underlying distance and position parameters respectively. D is a distance scaling factor, and it is great than zero. $S_{1:M} > 0$ are shape scaling factors, and $h_{1:M}$ are shape functions. $A_{1:M-1} \in \{0, 1\}$ are degeneracy constants, and the dimension of the PF is reduced by one if for each $A_i = 0$. $\mathbf{t}^q$ is a transition vector. "$\leftarrow$" indicates that each transition vector is generated from another vector by transformation functions.

It is worth noting that the number of objectives of DAC-MaOPs can be easily scaled by tuning the parameter of M. The difficulty level of DAC-MaOPs can be also easily adjusted by assigning a difficulty triplet with only three independent parameters ranging from 0 to 1.

VI. A set of difficulty adjustable CMOPs

In this section, as an example, a set of fifteen difficulty adjustable CMOPs (DAC-MOP1-15) with different difficulty types and levels of constraints is suggested through the proposed toolkit. The detailed definitions of constraints and difficulty triplets of DAC-MOP1-15 are shown in Table II and Table III respectively. DAC-MOP1-10 have two objectives, and their objectives are defined in (7) and (8). More specifically, the objectives of DAC-MOP1, DAC-MOP3, DAC-MOP5 and DAC-MOP7 are defined in (7), and the rest of problems have the same objective functions defined in (8). The number of objectives of DAC-MOP10-15 is three, and their objective functions are stated in (9). The domains of decision vectors in DAC-MOP1-15 are set to $[0, 1]^n$. n is the number of decision variables, and here $n = 30$.

TABLE II
DAC-MOP Test Suite: The constraints and difficulty triplets of DAC-MOP1-10

Name	Constraint Functions and Parameters	(η, ζ, γ)
DAC-MOP1	$c(\mathbf{x}) = sin(a\pi x_1) - b \geq 0$ $a = 20, b = 0.5, n = 30$ $\eta = b = 0.5$	$(0.5, 0, 0)$
DAC-MOP2	It is same to that of DAC-MOP1.	$(0.5, 0, 0)$
DAC-MOP3	$c_1(\mathbf{x}) = (g_1(\mathbf{x}) - a) * (b - g_1(\mathbf{x})) \geq 0$ $c_2(\mathbf{x}) = (g_2(\mathbf{x}) - a) * (b - g_2(\mathbf{x})) \geq 0$ $a = 0.5, b = 0.51, n = 30$ $\zeta = \frac{1}{2} \lg(\frac{1}{b-a}) = 1$	$(0, 1, 0)$
DAC-MOP4	It is same to that of DAC-MOP3.	$(0, 1, 0)$
DAC-MOP5	$c_1(\mathbf{x}) = (g_1(\mathbf{x}) - a) * (b - g_1(\mathbf{x})) \geq 0$ $c_2(\mathbf{x}) = (g_2(\mathbf{x}) - a) * (b - g_2(\mathbf{x})) \geq 0$ $c_3(\mathbf{x}) = sin(c\pi x_1) - d \geq 0$ $a = 0.5, b = 0.51, c = 20, d = 0.5$ $\eta = d = 0.5, n = 30$ $\zeta = \frac{1}{2} \lg(\frac{1}{b-a}) = 1$	$(0.5, 1, 0)$
DAC-MOP6	It is same to that of DAC-MOP5.	$(0.5, 1, 0)$
DAC-MOP7	$c_k(\mathbf{x}) = (\frac{(f_1 - p_k)}{\cos\theta} - \frac{(f_2 - q_k)}{\sin\theta})^2/a^2$ $+(\frac{(f_1 - p_k)}{\sin\theta} + \frac{(f_2 - q_k)}{\cos\theta})^2/b^2 \geq r$ $c_{10}(\mathbf{x}) = sin(c\pi x_1) - d \geq 0$ $p = [0, 1, 0, 1, 2, 0, 1, 2, 3], k = 1, \ldots, 9$ $q = [1.5, 0.5, 2.5, 1.5,$ $0.5, 3.5, 2.5, 1.5, 0.5]$ $a^2 = 0.1, b^2 = 0.4, \theta = -0.25\pi, r = 1$ $c = 20, d = 0.5, n = 30, x_j \in [0, 1]$ $\eta = d = 0.5, \gamma = 0.5r = 0.5$	$(0.5, 0, 0.5)$
DAC-MOP8	It is same to that of DAC-MOP7.	$(0.5, 0, 0.5)$
DAC-MOP9	$c_k(\mathbf{x}) = (\frac{(f_1 - p_k)}{\cos\theta} - \frac{(f_2 - q_k)}{\sin\theta})^2/a_k^2$ $+(\frac{(f_1 - p_k)}{\sin\theta} + \frac{(f_2 - q_k)}{\cos\theta})^2/b_k^2 \geq \frac{r}{15}$ $p = [0.8, 1.4, 1.9], q = [0.8, 1.4, 1.9]$ $a = [1.5, 1.0, 1.0], b = [4.0, 6.0, 8.0]$ $\theta = -0.25\pi, n = 30, r = 1.5$ $\gamma = 0.5r = 0.75, k = 1, 2, 3.$	$(0, 0, 0.75)$
DAC-MOP10	$c_k(\mathbf{x}) = (\frac{(f_1 - p_k)}{\cos\theta} - \frac{(f_2 - q_k)}{\sin\theta})^2/a_k^2$ $+(\frac{(f_1 - p_k)}{\sin\theta} + \frac{(f_2 - q_k)}{\cos\theta})^2/b_k^2 \geq \frac{r}{15}$ $p = [0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1.1]$ $q = [0.75, 0.5, 0.25, 1.1]$ $a = 0.5, b = 2.0, r = 1.5$ $\theta = [0.25\pi, 0.25\pi, 0.25\pi, -0.25\pi]$ $\gamma = 0.5r = 0.75$	$(0, 0, 0.75)$

It is worth noting that for this set of DAC-MOPs, the nonzero triplet elements are set to be relatively large values (0.5, 0.75, 1), indicating the difficulty levels of these test instances are relatively high. If we want to reduce the difficulty levels of the test instances in practice, we only need to adjust the parameters of the triplet elements to smaller values, and generate a new set of test instances in the same way.

TABLE III
DAC-MOP TEST SUITE: THE CONSTRAINTS AND DIFFICULTY TRIPLETS OF DAC-MOP11-15

Name	Constraint Functions and Parameters	(η, ζ, γ)
DAC-MOP11	$c_1(\mathbf{x}) = sin(a\pi x_1) - b \geq 0$ $c_2(\mathbf{x}) = sin(c\pi x_2) - d \geq 0$ $c_3(\mathbf{x}) = 1 - x_1^2 - x_2^2 \geq 0$ $a = 10, b = 0.6, c = 10, d = 0.4$ $\eta = (b + d)/2 = 0.5$	$(0.5, 0, 0)$
DAC-MOP12	$c_1(\mathbf{x}) = g(\mathbf{x}) - a \geq 0$ $c_2(\mathbf{x}) = b - g(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ $a = 0.5, b = 0.51, n = 10, x_j \in [0, 1]$ $\zeta = \frac{1}{2} \lg(\frac{1}{b-a}) = 1$	$(0, 1, 0)$
DAC-MOP13	$c_1(\mathbf{x}) = sin(a\pi x_1) - b \geq 0$ $c_2(\mathbf{x}) = sin(c\pi x_2) - d \geq 0$ $c_3(\mathbf{x}) = e - g(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ $c_4(\mathbf{x}) = g(\mathbf{x}) - f \geq 0$ $c_5(\mathbf{x}) = 1 - x_1^2 - x_2^2 \geq 0$ $a = 10, b = 0.6, c = 10, d = 0.4$ $e = 0.51, f = 0.5, n = 10$ $\eta = (b + d)/2 = 0.5, \zeta = \frac{1}{2} \lg(\frac{1}{e-f}) = 1$	$(0.5, 1, 0)$
DAC-MOP14	$c_1(\mathbf{x}) = f_1^2 + f_2^2 + f_3^2 - a \geq 0$ $c_2(\mathbf{x}) = b - (f_1^2 + f_2^2 + f_3^2) \geq 0$ $c_3(\mathbf{x}) = 1 - x_1^2 - x_2^2 \geq 0$ $c_4(\mathbf{x}) = c - \lvert f_1 - f_2 \rvert \geq 0$ $a = 1.5, b = 1.6, c = 0.1, n = 10$ $\gamma = \frac{1}{2} \lg(\frac{1}{b-a}) = 0.5$	$(0, 0.5, 0)$
DAC-MOP15	$c_1(\mathbf{x}) = f_1^2 + f_2^2 + f_3^2 - a \geq 0$ $c_2(\mathbf{x}) = b - (f_1^2 + f_2^2 + f_3^2) \geq 0$ $c_3(\mathbf{x}) = 1 - x_1^2 - x_2^2 \geq 0$ $c_4(\mathbf{x}) = c - cos(d\pi * (f_1 - f_2)) \geq 0$ $a = 1.5, b = 1.6, c = 0.1, d = 5, n = 10$ $\eta = c = 0.1, \gamma = \frac{1}{2} \lg(\frac{1}{b-a}) = 0.5$	(0.1,0,0.5)

$$\begin{cases} \text{Minimize} & f_1(\mathbf{x}) = x_1 + g_1(\mathbf{x}) \\ \text{Minimize} & f_2(\mathbf{x}) = 1 - x_1^2 + g_2(\mathbf{x}) \\ \text{where} & g_1(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j \in J_1} (x_j - sin(0.5\pi x_1))^2 \\ & g_2(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j \in J_2} (x_j - cos(0.5\pi x_1))^2 \\ & J_1 = \{j | j \text{ is odd and } 2 \leq j \leq n\} \\ & J_2 = \{j | j \text{ is even and } 2 \leq j \leq n\} \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

$$\begin{cases} \text{Minimize} & f_1(\mathbf{x}) = x_1 + g_1(\mathbf{x}) \\ \text{Minimize} & f_2(\mathbf{x}) = 1 - \sqrt{x_1} + g_2(\mathbf{x}) \\ \text{where} & g_1(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j \in J_1} (x_j - sin(0.5\pi x_1))^2 \\ & g_2(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j \in J_2} (x_j - cos(0.5\pi x_1))^2 \\ & J_1 = \{j | j \text{ is odd and } 2 \leq j \leq n\} \\ & J_2 = \{j | j \text{ is even and } 2 \leq j \leq n\} \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

$$\begin{cases} \text{Minimize} & f_1(\mathbf{x}) = x_1 + g(\mathbf{x}) \\ \text{Minimize} & f_2(\mathbf{x}) = x_2 + g(\mathbf{x}) \\ \text{Minimize} & f_3(\mathbf{x}) = 1 - x_1^2 - x_2^2 + g(\mathbf{x}) \\ \text{where} & g(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=3}^{n} (2x_j - sin(0.5j\pi x_1) \\ & -cos(0.5j\pi x_2))^2 \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

VII. EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

A. Experimental Settings

To verify the difficulty type of the suggested test instances DAC-MOP1-15, two commonly used CMOEAs (i.e., MOEA/D-CDP and NSGA-II-CDP) with SBX operator are tested on them in the experiment. Two popular many-objective algorithms (i.e., CMOEA/DD [48] and CNSGA-III [49], [50]) with DE operator are adopted to test three, five, seven and ten-objective DAC-MaOP1-9 with different difficulty triplets in this experiment. The detailed parameters of the algorithms are summarized as follows.

1) Setting for reproduction operators: The mutation probability $Pm = 1/n$ (n is the number of decision vectors). For the polynomial mutation operator, the distribution index is 20 for DAC-MOP1-15. For DAC-MaOP1-9, the distribution index is set to 30.
2) For the DE operator, $CR = 1.0$ and $f = 0.5$.
3) For the SBX operator, the distribution index is 20.
4) Population size: For DAC-MOP1-10, $N = 200$, and for DAC-MOP11-15, $N = 300$. For DAC-MaOP1-9 with $3, 5, 7, 10$ objectives, N is set to $105, 210, 210, 220$ respectively.
5) Number of runs and stopping condition: Each algorithm runs 30 times independently on each test problems. The maximum function evaluations is 150 000 for DAC-MOP1-10, and for DAC-MOP11-15, it is set to 200 000. For DAC-MaOP1-9 with $3, 5, 7, 10$ objectives, the maximum function evaluations is set to $200000, 300000, 400000, 500000$ respectively.
6) Neighborhood size: $T = 20$.
7) Probability use to select in the neighborhood: $\delta = 0.9$.
8) The maximal number of solutions replaced by a child: $nr = 2$.

B. Performance Metric

To measure the performance of MOEA/D-CDP, NSGA-II-CDP, CNSGA-III and CMOEA/DD, a hypervolume indicator (HV) [51] is adopted. HV considers both the distribution of the obtained Pareto front A and its vicinity to the true Pareto front. $HV(A, R)$ is defined as the volume enclosed by A and the reference vector $R = (R_1, \ldots, R_m)$. The detailed definition of HV is listed as follows:

$$HV(A, R) = Vol_{v \in A}(v, R) \tag{10}$$

Here, A is an approximate Pareto front set achieved by an algorithm. The reference point R is $(1.2, 1.2)^T$ for DAC-MOP1-2 and DAC-MOP7-10. For DAC-MOP3-6, the reference point R is set to $(1.6, 1.6)^T$. For DAC-MOP11-15, the reference point R is set to $(2.0, 2.0, 2.0)^T$. For DAC-MaOP1-9, the reference point R is set to $(3.0, \ldots, 2m + 1.0)^T$, and $m = 1, \ldots, M$. M is the number of objectives for DAC-MaOP1-9 with different difficulty triplets. It is worth noting that the larger value of HV represents the better performance of both diversity and convergence.

C. Performance Comparisons on DAC-MOP1-15

The statistic results of the HV values obtained by MOEA/D-CDP and NSGA-II-CDP are summarized in Table IV. In general, none of the two algorithms is able to solve all instances very well. More specifically, MOEA/D-CDP shows the better performance on DAC-MOP7-12. NSGA-II-CDP shows the better performance on DAC-MOP1-6 and DAC-MOP13-15. In order to further analysis the effects of constraints with different difficulty types and levels, we have plotted the non-dominated solutions in the best run obtained by each algorithm on five typical problems (DAC-MOP1, DAC-MOP4, DAC-MOP6, DAC-MOP7 and DAC-MOP9) in Fig. 7. In the following, some discussions are made based on the observation of Fig. 7.

TABLE IV
BEST, MEDIAN AND WORST HV VALUES OBTAINED BY MOEA/D-CDP AND NSGA-II-CDP ON DAC-MOP1-15. DAC-MOP1-10 HAVE TWO OBJECTIVES, AND DAC-MOP11-15 HAVE THREE OBJECTIVES. BEST PERFORMANCE IS HIGHLIGHTED IN BOLD FONT.

	MOEA/D-CDP	NSGA-II-CDP
DAC-MOP1	**4.141E-01**	4.018E-01
	3.424E-01	**3.498E-01**
	2.636E-01	**2.762E-01**
DAC-MOP2	6.046E-01	**6.066E-01**
	5.314E-01	**5.513E-01**
	4.493E-01	4.490E-01
DAC-MOP3	1.036E-01	**1.138E-01**
	8.776E-02	**1.021E-01**
	6.915E-02	**8.597E-02**
DAC-MOP4	2.148E-01	**2.287E-01**
	1.892E-01	**2.128E-01**
	1.478E-01	**1.889E-01**
DAC-MOP5	9.153E-02	**1.213E-01**
	8.521E-02	**9.563E-02**
	6.466E-02	**8.614E-02**
DAC-MOP6	2.060E-01	**2.261E-01**
	1.891E-01	**2.022E-01**
	1.673E-01	**1.906E-01**
DAC-MOP7	**2.397E-01**	1.940E-01
	2.176E-01	1.595E-01
	1.650E-01	1.166E-01
DAC-MOP8	**6.030E-01**	5.436E-01
	5.291E-01	4.659E-01
	4.493E-01	2.388E-01
DAC-MOP9	**5.415E-03**	5.393E-03
	5.309E-03	5.273E-03
	5.167E-03	5.100E-03
DAC-MOP10	**6.557E-01**	6.097E-01
	5.753E-01	5.589E-01
	5.064E-01	5.047E-01
DAC-MOP11	**4.927E-01**	4.920E-01
	4.828E-01	4.794E-01
	4.269E-01	**4.719E-01**
DAC-MOP12	**1.532E-01**	1.440E-01
	1.347E-01	1.344E-01
	1.294E-01	**1.294E-01**
DAC-MOP13	1.389E-01	**1.395E-01**
	1.359E-01	**1.369E-01**
	1.265E-01	**1.335E-01**
DAC-MOP14	**3.337E-01**	3.334E-01
	3.231E-01	**3.231E-01**
	2.797E-01	**3.131E-01**
DAC-MOP15	3.211E-01	**3.241E-01**
	3.167E-01	**3.186E-01**
	2.853E-01	**3.056E-01**

The difficulty triplet of DAC-MOP1 is set to $(0.5, 0, 0)$. Thus, DAC-MOP1 has constraints with diversity-hardness, and the difficult level of diversity-hardness is 0.5. The PF of DAC-MOP1 has a number of disconnected segments caused by the Type-I constraints. Each algorithm only obtains several disconnected segments in the PF as shown in Fig. 7(a) and Fig. 7(f). As each segments in the PF of DAC-MOP1 is isolated with each other, it is difficult for CMOEAs to find all disconnected segments in the PF. Thus, Type-I constraints have the difficulty of diversity-hardness in CMOPs.

DAC-MOP4 has constraints with feasibility-hardness, and its difficulty triplet is $(0, 1, 0)$. It has the maximum difficult level of feasibility-hardness. MOEA/D-CDP and NSGA-II-CDP only achieve a small part of PF as shown in Fig. 7(b) and Fig. 7(g). As the portion of feasible regions of DAC-MOP4 is very small, in the early stage of evolutionary process of each algorithm, solutions with lower overall constraint violations are selected based on CDP constraint-handling method, and the diversity of the working population is not maintained well. Finally, only a few of Pareto optimal points are found by MOEA/D-CDP and NSGA-II-CDP. Therefore, Type-II constraints have the difficulty of feasibility-hardness in CMOPs.

The difficulty triplet of DAC-MOP6 is $(0.5, 1, 0)$. Thus, DAC-MOP6 has constraints with diversity-hardness and feasibility-hardness simultaneously. Each algorithm only achieves a few parts of PF as shown in Fig. 7(c) and Fig. 7(h). As the feasible region is narrow and the PF is disconnected, DAC-MOP6 is more difficult to solve than DAC-MOP1 and DAC-MOP4. Therefore, the difficulty level indeed affects the difficulty of solving a CMOP.

DAC-MOP7 has constraints with diversity-hardness and convergence-hardness simultaneously, and its difficulty triplet is $(0.5, 0, 0.5)$. Each algorithm only obtains a few of Pareto optimal points as shown in Fig. 7(d) and Fig. 7(i), and many non-dominated solutions obtained by each algorithm are situated on the constraint boundaries. As the PF is disconnected and infeasiblity comes on the way of converging to PF, DAC-MOP7 is more difficult to solve than DAC-MOP1. Thus, CMOPs with hybrid difficulty types of constraints is more difficult than those with single difficulty type of constraints.

DAC-MOP9 has constraints with convergence-hardness, and its difficulty triplet is $(0, 0, 0.75)$. The constraints of DAC-MOP9 come on the way of converging to its PF. Each algorithm converges to their constraint boundaries, and neither of them has achieved any Pareto optimal points on the true PF as shown in Fig. 7(e) and Fig. 7(j). Thus, Type-III constraints indeed have the difficulty of convergence-hardness in CMOPs.

From the above observation, it can be concluded that the proposed toolkit is able to introduce various types and levels of difficulties into constraint functions.

D. Performance Comparisons on DAC-MaOP1-9

The statistic results of the HV values obtained by CMOEA/DD and CNSGA-III on three, five, seven and ten-objective DAC-MaOP1-9 with different difficulty levels are summarized in Table V, Table VI and Table VII. For each problem, four different difficulty triplets are set respectively.



Fig. 7. Non-dominated solutions obtained by MOEA/D-CDP and NSGA-II-CDP on DAC-MOP1, DAC-MOP4, DAC-MOP6, DAC-MOP7 and DAC-MOP9 in the run with the best HV value. (a) DAC-MOP1. (b) DAC-MOP4. (c) DAC-MOP6. (d) DAC-MOP7. (e) DAC-MOP9. (f) DAC-MOP1. (g) DAC-MOP4. (h) DAC-MOP6. (i) DAC-MOP7. (j) DAC-MOP9.

The difficulty triplet $D = (0.5, 0, 0)$ represents diversity-hard constraints with the difficulty level $\eta = 0.5$. $D = (0, 0.5, 0)$ represents feasibility-hard constraints with the difficulty level $\zeta = 0.5$. $D = (0, 0, 0.5)$ represents the convergence-hard constraints with the difficulty level $\gamma = 0.5$. $D = (0.5, 0.5, 0.5)$ represents diversity-, feasibility- and convergence-hard constraints, and each difficulty level is 0.5. In general, none of the two algorithms is able to solve all instances very well.

For three, five, seven and ten-objective DAC-MaOP1 with the difficulty triplet $(0, 0.5, 0)$, CNSGA-III performs better than CMOEA/DD, and the parallel coordinates of the best nondominated solutions with seven and ten-objective DAC-MaOP1 obtained by each algorithm are shown in Fig. 8(a)-(d). However, CMOEA/DD gets better HV values than CNSGA-III on three and ten-objective DAC-MaOP1 with the difficulty triplet $(0, 0, 0, 5)$. From the above observation, it is easily seen that CNSGA-III works better than CMOEA/DD on DAC-MaOP1 with feasibility-hard constraints, and CMOEA/DD performs better than CNSGA-III on DAC-MaOP1 with diversity-hard constraints.

For DAC-MaOP2, CMOEA/DD performs better than CNSGA-III on most cases, and the parallel coordinates of the best nondominated solutions of seven-objective DAC-MaOP2 with difficulty triplets $(0, 0, 0.5)$ obtained by each algorithm are shown in Fig. 8(e)-(f). CNSGA-III works better than CMOEA/DD on seven and ten-objective DAC-MaOP2 with the difficulty triplet $(0, 0.5, 0)$. It can be observed that CMOEA/DD works better than CNSGA-III on DAC-MaOP2 with convergence- and diversity-hard constraints.

For DAC-MaOP3, CMOEA/DD also performs better than CNSGA-III on most cases, and the parallel coordinates of the best nondominated solutions of five and seven-objective DAC-MaOP3 with difficulty triplets $(0, 0, 0.5)$ obtained by each algorithm are shown in Fig. 8(g)-(j). CNSGA-III performs better than CMOEA/DD on seven and ten-objective DAC-MaOP3 with the difficulty triplet $(0, 0.5, 0)$. From the above observation, it is easily seen that CMOEA/DD works better than CNSGA-III on DAC-MaOP3 with convergence-hard constraints.

For DAC-MaOP4, CMOEA/DD also performs better than CNSGA-III on most cases, and the parallel coordinates of the best nondominated solutions of ten-objective DAC-MaOP4 with difficulty triplets $(0, 0, 0.5)$ obtained by each algorithm are shown in Fig. 8(k)-(l). it is easily seen that CMOEA/DD performs better than CNSGA-III on DAC-MaOP4 with diversity- and convergence-hard constraints.

For ten-objective DAC-MaOP5 with difficulty triplets $(0.5, 0, 0), (0, 0.5, 0)$ and $(0, 0, 0.5)$, CNSGA-III is better than CMOEA/DD. However, for the rest of DAC-MaOP5 problems, CMOEA/DD works better than CNSGA-III. Fig. 8(m)-(r) show the parallel coordinates of the best nondominated solutions of five, seven and ten-objective DAC-MaOP5 with difficulty the triplet $(0.5, 0.5, 0.5)$ obtained by each algorithm. It can be observed that CMOEA/DD is better than CNSGA-III on DAC-MaOP5 with hybrid of diversity-, feasibility- and convergence-hard constraints.

For DAC-MaOP6, CNSGA-III performs better than CMOEA/DD on most cases, and the parallel coordinates of the best nondominated solutions of ten-objective DAC-MaOP6 with difficulty triplets $(0, 0, 0.5)$ obtained by each algorithm are shown in Fig. 8(s)-(t). However, for five and seven-objective DAC-MaOP6 with the difficulty triplet $(0.5, 0.5, 0.5)$, CMOEA/DD works better than CNSGA-III. It can be seen that CNSGA-III is better than CMOEA/DD on DAC-MaOP6 with diversity-, feasibility- or convergence-hard constraints.

For DAC-MaOP7, CMOEA/DD works better than NSGA-III on all of instances except for ten-objective DAC-MaOP7 with difficulty triplets $(0, 0.5, 0)$ and $(0.5, 0.5, 0.5)$. The parallel coordinates of the best nondominated solutions of seven-objective DAC-MaOP7 with difficulty triplets $(0.5, 0, 0)$ obtained by each algorithm are shown in Fig. 8(u)-(v). It can be observed that CMOEA/DD is better than CNSGA-III on DAC-MaOP7 with diversity- or convergence-hard constraints.

For DAC-MaOP8 problems, CMOEA/DD performs better than CNSGA-III on most cases. For DAC-MaOP9, CMOEA/DD works better than CNSGA-III on five and ten-

objective DAC-MaOP9 with the difficulty triplet $(0.5, 0.5, 0.5)$ and seven-objective DAC-MaOP9 with difficulty triplets $(0.5, 0, 0), (0, 0.5, 0)$ and $(0, 0, 0.5)$. The parallel coordinates of the best nondominated solutions of seven-objective DAC-MaOP9 with difficulty triplets $(0.5, 0, 0)$ obtained by each algorithm are shown in Fig. 8(w)-(x). For three and ten-objective DAC-MaOP9 with difficulty triplets $(0.5, 0, 0), (0, 0.5, 0)$ and $(0, 0, 0.5)$, CNSGA-III performs better than CMOEA/DD.

VIII. Conclusion

In this work, we proposed a construction toolkit to build difficulty controllable and scalable constrained multi-objective test problems. The method used to design the construction toolkit is based on three primary constraint functions identified to correspond to three primary difficulty types of CMOPs. The method is also scalable because the number of objectives can be conveniently extended. As an example, a set of difficulty adjustable CMOPs (DAC-MOP1-15) and CMaOPs (DAC-MaOP1-9) was generated using this construction toolkit. To verify the effectiveness of the suggested test instances, comprehensive experiments were conducted to test the performance of two popular CMOEAs (MOEA/D-CDP and NSGA-II-CDP) on DAC-MOP1-15 and two constrained many-objective evolutionary algorithms (CNSGA-III and CMOEA/DD) on DAC-MaOP1-9. Through analyzing the performance of MOEA/D-CDP and NSGA-II-CDP on DAC-MOP1-15 and the performance of CNSGA-III and CMOEA/DD on DAC-MaOP1-9, it is found that the three primary types of difficulties did exist in the corresponding test problems, and the algorithms under test showed different behaviors in reaching the PFs. The observation demonstrates that the proposed method of constructing the CMOPs is very efficient and effective to help evaluate the performance of the tested algorithms.

Acknowledgment

This research work was supported by Guangdong Key Laboratory of Digital Signal and Image Processing, the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant (61175073, 61300159, 61332002, 51375287), Jiangsu Natural Science Foundation (BK20130808) and Science and Technology Planning Project of Guangdong Province, China (2013B011304002).

References

[1] T. P. Runarsson and X. Yao, "Search biases in constrained evolutionary optimization," *Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part C: Applications and Reviews, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 233–243, 2005.

[2] C. A. Coello Coello, "Theoretical and numerical constraint-handling techniques used with evolutionary algorithms: a survey of the state of the art," *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, vol. 191, no. 11-12, pp. 1245–1287, Jan. 2002.

[3] F. Hoffmeister and J. Sprave, "Problem-independent handling of constraints by use of metric penalty functions," 1996.

[4] J. A. Joines and C. R. Houck, "On the use of non-stationary penalty functions to solve nonlinear constrained optimization problems with ga's," in *Evolutionary Computation, 1994. IEEE World Congress on Computational Intelligence., Proceedings of the First IEEE Conference on*. IEEE, 1994, pp. 579–584.

[5] F.-z. Huang, L. Wang, and Q. He, "An effective co-evolutionary differential evolution for constrained optimization," *Applied Mathematics and computation*, vol. 186, no. 1, pp. 340–356, 2007.

[6] J. C. Bean and A. ben Hadj-Alouane, *A dual genetic algorithm for bounded integer programs*, 1993.

[7] D. W. Coit, A. E. Smith, and D. M. Tate, "Adaptive penalty methods for genetic optimization of constrained combinatorial problems," *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 173–182, 1996.

[8] A. Ben Hadj-Alouane and J. C. Bean, "A genetic algorithm for the multiple-choice integer program," *Operations research*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 92–101, 1997.

[9] B. Tessema and G. G. Yen, "A self adaptive penalty function based algorithm for constrained optimization," in *Evolutionary Computation, 2006. CEC 2006. IEEE Congress on*. IEEE, 2006, pp. 246–253.

[10] Y. G. Woldesenbet, G. G. Yen, and B. G. Tessema, "Constraint handling in multiobjective evolutionary optimization," *Evolutionary Computation, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 514–525, 2009.

[11] T. P. Runarsson and X. Yao, "Stochastic ranking for constrained evolutionary optimization," *Evolutionary Computation, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 284–294, 2000.

[12] K. Deb, "An efficient constraint handling method for genetic algorithms," *Computer methods in applied mechanics and engineering*, vol. 186, no. 2, pp. 311–338, 2000.

[13] M. Laumanns, L. Thiele, and E. Zitzler, "An efficient, adaptive parameter variation scheme for metaheuristics based on the epsilon-constraint method," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 169, no. 3, pp. 932–942, 2006.

[14] T. Takahama, S. Sakai, and N. Iwane, "Constrained optimization by the ε constrained hybrid algorithm of particle swarm optimization and genetic algorithm," in *AI 2005: Advances in Artificial Intelligence*. Springer, 2005, pp. 389–400.

[15] T. Ray, H. K. Singh, A. Isaacs, and W. Smith, "Infeasibility driven evolutionary algorithm for constrained optimization," in *Constraint-handling in evolutionary optimization*. Springer, 2009, pp. 145–165.

[16] P. D. Surry and N. J. Radcliffe, "The comoga method: constrained optimisation by multi-objective genetic algorithms," *Control and Cybernetics*, vol. 26, pp. 391–412, 1997.

[17] Z. Cai and Y. Wang, "A multiobjective optimization-based evolutionary algorithm for constrained optimization," *Evolutionary Computation, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 10, no. 6, pp. 658–675, 2006.

[18] Y. Wang, Z. Cai, Y. Zhou, and W. Zeng, "An adaptive tradeoff model for constrained evolutionary optimization," *Evolutionary Computation, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 80–92, 2008.

[19] B. Y. Qu and P. N. Suganthan, "Constrained multi-objective optimization algorithm with an ensemble of constraint handling methods," *Engineering Optimization*, vol. 43, no. 4, pp. 403–416, 2011.

[20] K. Deb, A. Pratap, S. Agarwal, and T. Meyarivan, "A fast and elitist multiobjective genetic algorithm: NSGA-II," *Evolutionary Computation, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 182–197, 2002.

[21] D. W. Corne, N. R. Jerram, J. D. Knowles, M. J. Oates *et al.*, "PESA-II: Region-based selection in evolutionary multiobjective optimization," in *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference (GECCO'2001)*. Citeseer, 2001.

[22] E. Zitzler, M. Laumanns, L. Thiele, E. Zitzler, E. Zitzler, L. Thiele, and L. Thiele, "SPEA2: Improving the strength pareto evolutionary algorithm," 2001.

[23] Q. Zhang and H. Li, "MOEA/D: A multiobjective evolutionary algorithm based on decomposition," *Evolutionary Computation, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 712–731, 2007.

[24] H. Li and Q. Zhang, "Multiobjective optimization problems with complicated pareto sets, MOEA/D and NSGA-II," *Evolutionary Computation, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 284–302, 2009.

[25] H.-L. Liu, F. Gu, and Q. Zhang, "Decomposition of a multiobjective optimization problem into a number of simple multiobjective subproblems," *Evolutionary Computation, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 450–455, 2014.

[26] X. Cai, Y. Li, Z. Fan, and Q. Zhang, "An external archive guided multiobjective evolutionary algorithm based on decomposition for combinatorial optimization," *Evolutionary Computation, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 508–523, Aug 2015.

[27] E. Zitzler and S. Künzli, "Indicator-based selection in multiobjective search," in *Parallel Problem Solving from Nature-PPSN VIII*. Springer, 2004, pp. 832–842.

[28] D. H. Phan and J. Suzuki, "R2-IBEA: R2 indicator based evolutionary algorithm for multiobjective optimization," in *Evolutionary Computation (CEC), 2013 IEEE Congress on*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 1836–1845.

[29] N. Beume, B. Naujoks, and M. Emmerich, "SMS-EMOA: Multiobjective selection based on dominated hypervolume," *European Journal of Operational Research*, vol. 181, no. 3, pp. 1653–1669, 2007.

TABLE V
BEST, MEDIAN AND WORST HV VALUES OBTAINED BY CMOEA/DD AND CNSGA-III ON M-OBJECTIVE DAC-MAOP1-3. BEST PERFORMANCE IS HIGHLIGHTED IN BOLD FONT

Instance		DAC-MaOP1		DAC-MaOP2		DAC-MaOP3	
M	Difficulty Triplet (D)	CMOEA/DD	CNSGA-III	CMOEA/DD	CNSGA-III	CMOEA/DD	CNSGA-III
3	(0.5,0,0)	**4.224E-01**	4.185E-01	**7.165E-01**	6.049E-01	**5.874E-01**	4.939E-01
		4.139E-01	**4.157E-01**	**6.806E-01**	5.477E-01	**5.650E-01**	4.764E-01
		3.938E-01	**4.118E-01**	**6.438E-01**	4.654E-01	**5.423E-01**	4.621E-01
	(0,0.5,0)	4.488E-01	**6.310E-01**	**6.545E-01**	6.424E-01	**5.283E-01**	5.148E-01
		4.426E-01	**6.134E-01**	**6.525E-01**	5.629E-01	**5.263E-01**	5.074E-01
		4.361E-01	**5.921E-01**	**6.497E-01**	4.288E-01	**5.230E-01**	4.977E-01
	(0,0,0.5)	**4.121E-01**	4.062E-01	**8.902E-01**	7.057E-01	**6.143E-01**	5.093E-01
		4.079E-01	4.030E-01	**8.666E-01**	6.084E-01	**5.066E-01**	4.601E-01
		4.032E-01	3.977E-01	**7.670E-01**	4.400E-01	3.985E-01	**4.383E-01**
	(0.5,0.5,0.5)	4.366E-01	**6.007E-01**	**5.218E-01**	4.212E-01	**4.517E-01**	2.842E-01
		4.329E-01	**5.435E-01**	**4.621E-01**	3.057E-01	**4.208E-01**	1.914E-01
		4.287E-01	**4.323E-01**	**3.002E-01**	1.758E-01	**3.812E-01**	7.933E-02
5	(0.5,0,0)	**3.697E-01**	3.611E-01	**6.817E-01**	6.245E-01	**5.233E-01**	4.400E-01
		3.552E-01	**3.574E-01**	**6.446E-01**	4.913E-01	**4.973E-01**	3.973E-01
		3.343E-01	**3.429E-01**	**6.178E-01**	3.763E-01	**4.674E-01**	3.483E-01
	(0,0.5,0)	3.904E-01	**5.936E-01**	**6.235E-01**	6.199E-01	4.941E-01	**4.967E-01**
		3.856E-01	**5.813E-01**	**6.219E-01**	6.150E-01	**4.912E-01**	4.882E-01
		3.840E-01	**5.657E-01**	**6.191E-01**	6.082E-01	**4.881E-01**	4.769E-01
	(0,0,0.5)	**3.725E-01**	3.691E-01	**9.396E-01**	7.014E-01	**6.198E-01**	5.012E-01
		3.700E-01	3.667E-01	**9.300E-01**	6.337E-01	**5.897E-01**	4.442E-01
		3.645E-01	**3.652E-01**	**9.208E-01**	5.888E-01	**4.633E-01**	3.500E-01
	(0.5,0.5,0.5)	3.814E-01	**5.647E-01**	**4.938E-01**	4.690E-01	**2.790E-01**	1.982E-01
		3.794E-01	**5.309E-01**	**4.423E-01**	3.062E-01	1.713E-01	**1.886E-01**
		3.787E-01	**4.728E-01**	**2.678E-01**	1.483E-01	**1.444E-01**	1.411E-01
7	(0.5,0,0)	**3.427E-01**	3.337E-01	5.784E-01	**6.105E-01**	**4.555E-01**	4.320E-01
		3.361E-01	3.169E-01	**5.747E-01**	4.656E-01	**4.519E-01**	3.228E-01
		3.348E-01	3.074E-01	**5.695E-01**	3.614E-01	**4.494E-01**	2.533E-01
	(0,0.5,0)	3.418E-01	**5.580E-01**	5.789E-01	**5.828E-01**	4.534E-01	**4.684E-01**
		3.362E-01	**5.380E-01**	5.744E-01	**5.796E-01**	4.513E-01	**4.652E-01**
		3.347E-01	**5.259E-01**	5.677E-01	**5.750E-01**	4.478E-01	**4.616E-01**
	(0,0,0.5)	3.122E-01	**3.164E-01**	**9.483E-01**	7.498E-01	**5.406E-01**	5.113E-01
		3.073E-01	**3.119E-01**	**9.379E-01**	6.476E-01	**5.119E-01**	3.898E-01
		3.020E-01	**3.084E-01**	**9.255E-01**	5.547E-01	**4.516E-01**	3.114E-01
	(0.5,0.5,0.5)	3.297E-01	**5.432E-01**	**4.423E-01**	4.286E-01	**2.421E-01**	1.703E-01
		3.283E-01	**3.677E-01**	**3.261E-01**	2.726E-01	1.112E-01	**1.267E-01**
		3.270E-01	1.889E-02	**2.360E-01**	2.145E-01	2.463E-02	**6.542E-02**
10	(0.5,0,0)	2.761E-01	**2.846E-01**	**7.525E-01**	5.604E-01	**3.891E-01**	3.278E-01
		2.701E-01	2.568E-01	**6.779E-01**	4.337E-01	**3.287E-01**	2.535E-01
		2.150E-01	**2.283E-01**	**6.027E-01**	3.562E-01	**2.197E-01**	1.935E-01
	(0,0.5,0)	2.825E-01	**5.062E-01**	5.319E-01	**5.413E-01**	4.207E-01	**4.325E-01**
		2.784E-01	**4.881E-01**	5.245E-01	**5.360E-01**	4.174E-01	**4.292E-01**
		2.743E-01	**4.643E-01**	5.200E-01	**5.225E-01**	4.117E-01	**4.260E-01**
	(0,0,0.5)	**2.788E-01**	2.719E-01	**9.471E-01**	8.739E-01	**4.453E-01**	3.709E-01
		2.765E-01	2.659E-01	**9.333E-01**	6.804E-01	**3.466E-01**	2.910E-01
		2.736E-01	2.578E-01	**9.231E-01**	4.673E-01	**2.517E-01**	2.467E-01
	(0.5,0.5,0.5)	2.784E-01	**3.804E-01**	**2.706E-01**	2.683E-01	**4.670E-01**	1.255E-01
		2.734E-01	2.640E-01	**1.857E-01**	1.733E-01	**1.673E-01**	7.265E-02
		2.696E-01	1.172E-02	**1.188E-01**	1.176E-01	1.408E-02	**1.901E-02**

[30] J. Bader and E. Zitzler, "HypE: An algorithm for fast hypervolume-based many-objective optimization," *Evolutionary computation*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 45–76, 2011.

[31] K. Deb, "Multi-objective Genetic Algorithms: Problem Difficulties and Construction of Test Problems," *Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 205–230, 1999.

[32] H. Li and Q. Zhang, "Multiobjective Optimization Problems With Complicated Pareto Sets, MOEA/D and NSGA-II." *IEEE Trans. Evolutionary Computation*, 2009.

[33] K. Deb, L. Thiele, M. Laumanns, and E. Zitzler, *Scalable test problems for evolutionary multiobjective optimization*. Springer, 2005.

[34] H.-L. Liu, F. Gu, and Q. Zhang, "Decomposition of a Multiobjective Optimization Problem Into a Number of Simple Multiobjective Subproblems," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 450–455, 2014.

[35] H.-L. Liu, L. Chen, K. Deb, and E. Goodman, "Investigating the Effect of Imbalance Between Convergence and Diversity in Evolutionary Multiobjective Algorithms," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. PP, no. 99, pp. 1–1, 2016.

[36] R. Cheng, Y. Jin, M. Olhofer, and B. Sendhoff, "Test Problems for Large-Scale Multiobjective and Many-Objective Optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, pp. 1–14, 2016.

[37] S. Huband, P. Hingston, L. Barone, and L. While, "A review of multiobjective test problems and a scalable test problem toolkit," *Evolutionary Computation, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 10, no. 5, pp. 477–506, 2006.

[38] K. Deb, *Multi-objective optimization using evolutionary algorithms*. John Wiley & Sons, 2001, vol. 16.

[39] Q. Zhang, A. Zhou, S. Zhao, P. N. Suganthan, W. Liu, and S. Tiwari, "Multiobjective optimization test instances for the cec-2009 special session and competition," *University of Essex, Colchester, UK and Nanyang technological University, Singapore, special session on performance assessment of multi-objective optimization algorithms, technical report*, pp. 1–30, 2008.

[40] K. Deb, A. Pratap, and T. Meyarivan, "Constrained test problems for multi-objective evolutionary optimization," in *Evolutionary Multi-Criterion Optimization*. Springer, 2001, pp. 284–298.

TABLE VI
BEST, MEDIAN AND WORST HV VALUES OBTAINED BY CMOEA/DD AND CNSGA-III ON M-OBJECTIVE DAC-MAOP4-6. BEST PERFORMANCE IS HIGHLIGHTED IN BOLD FONT

Instance		DAC-MaOP4		DAC-MaOP5		DAC-MaOP6	
M	Difficulty Triplet (D)	CMOEA/DD	CNSGA-III	CMOEA/DD	CNSGA-III	CMOEA/DD	CNSGA-III
3	(0.5,0,0)	**5.386E-01**	4.865E-01	5.765E-01	**5.777E-01**	6.188E-01	**6.287E-01**
		5.174E-01	4.625E-01	**5.465E-01**	4.958E-01	5.849E-01	**6.099E-01**
		4.934E-01	4.171E-01	**5.198E-01**	4.326E-01	**4.956E-01**	4.658E-01
	(0,0.5,0)	4.083E-01	**4.086E-01**	**4.018E-01**	3.999E-01	4.130E-01	**4.275E-01**
		4.030E-01	4.000E-01	**3.961E-01**	3.830E-01	4.034E-01	**4.246E-01**
		3.957E-01	3.908E-01	**3.862E-01**	3.495E-01	3.891E-01	**4.119E-01**
	(0,0,0.5)	**5.944E-01**	5.692E-01	**6.311E-01**	6.306E-01	6.404E-01	**6.468E-01**
		5.765E-01	5.169E-01	6.128E-01	**6.130E-01**	6.322E-01	**6.443E-01**
		5.541E-01	4.483E-01	**5.891E-01**	5.568E-01	6.138E-01	**6.402E-01**
	(0.5,0.5,0.5)	**3.620E-01**	3.564E-01	**3.447E-01**	3.256E-01	3.769E-01	**3.857E-01**
		3.529E-01	3.246E-01	**3.308E-01**	1.833E-01	**3.419E-01**	3.354E-01
		3.328E-01	3.029E-01	**3.059E-01**	9.488E-02	**3.049E-01**	2.765E-01
5	(0.5,0,0)	**5.372E-01**	4.038E-01	**4.752E-01**	4.626E-01	5.474E-01	**6.180E-01**
		5.081E-01	3.367E-01	**4.518E-01**	4.013E-01	4.888E-01	**5.599E-01**
		4.842E-01	2.964E-01	**4.298E-01**	3.434E-01	4.264E-01	**5.001E-01**
	(0,0.5,0)	**4.953E-01**	4.775E-01	**4.632E-01**	4.589E-01	4.399E-01	**4.487E-01**
		4.923E-01	4.699E-01	**4.565E-01**	4.216E-01	4.380E-01	**4.448E-01**
		4.890E-01	4.608E-01	**4.514E-01**	3.665E-01	4.346E-01	**4.410E-01**
	(0,0,0.5)	**7.095E-01**	5.939E-01	**7.647E-01**	7.502E-01	6.898E-01	**7.079E-01**
		6.874E-01	5.411E-01	**7.400E-01**	6.855E-01	6.814E-01	**7.051E-01**
		6.638E-01	4.936E-01	**7.153E-01**	6.310E-01	6.662E-01	**7.026E-01**
	(0.5,0.5,0.5)	**4.052E-01**	3.530E-01	**3.394E-01**	1.790E-01	**3.580E-01**	3.449E-01
		3.948E-01	3.166E-01	**3.013E-01**	1.250E-01	**3.156E-01**	2.719E-01
		3.831E-01	2.033E-01	**2.496E-01**	7.326E-02	**2.643E-01**	2.006E-01
7	(0.5,0,0)	**5.037E-01**	3.337E-01	**4.752E-01**	4.507E-01	5.086E-01	**5.703E-01**
		5.012E-01	2.744E-01	**4.718E-01**	3.751E-01	**5.071E-01**	3.763E-01
		4.975E-01	2.271E-01	**4.684E-01**	2.922E-01	**5.047E-01**	2.509E-01
	(0,0.5,0)	**5.043E-01**	4.953E-01	**4.761E-01**	4.703E-01	5.084E-01	**5.234E-01**
		5.015E-01	4.901E-01	**4.714E-01**	4.270E-01	5.066E-01	**5.108E-01**
		4.990E-01	4.836E-01	**4.667E-01**	3.499E-01	**5.032E-01**	4.873E-01
	(0,0,0.5)	**7.363E-01**	5.789E-01	**8.103E-01**	7.884E-01	8.270E-01	**8.502E-01**
		7.196E-01	5.317E-01	**7.799E-01**	7.499E-01	8.141E-01	**8.494E-01**
		6.995E-01	4.836E-01	**7.453E-01**	7.242E-01	8.042E-01	**8.480E-01**
	(0.5,0.5,0.5)	**3.683E-01**	3.483E-01	**2.875E-01**	1.642E-01	**3.837E-01**	2.511E-01
		3.528E-01	2.747E-01	**1.918E-01**	1.165E-01	**3.468E-01**	1.636E-01
		3.313E-01	1.663E-01	**1.209E-01**	4.476E-02	**3.054E-01**	6.586E-02
10	(0.5,0,0)	**4.096E-01**	3.082E-01	4.063E-01	**4.655E-01**	3.655E-01	**4.993E-01**
		3.635E-01	2.335E-01	2.700E-01	**3.535E-01**	3.140E-01	**4.151E-01**
		3.038E-01	1.675E-01	1.927E-01	**2.717E-01**	2.728E-01	**3.099E-01**
	(0,0.5,0)	4.449E-01	**4.985E-01**	4.390E-01	**4.597E-01**	4.964E-01	**5.106E-01**
		4.327E-01	**4.872E-01**	4.245E-01	**4.364E-01**	4.492E-01	**5.058E-01**
		4.228E-01	**4.793E-01**	3.924E-01	**4.192E-01**	4.276E-01	**4.973E-01**
	(0,0,0.5)	**6.985E-01**	5.405E-01	7.884E-01	**8.299E-01**	8.056E-01	**8.721E-01**
		6.735E-01	5.054E-01	7.452E-01	**8.068E-01**	7.550E-01	**8.693E-01**
		6.368E-01	4.733E-01	6.944E-01	**7.780E-01**	7.242E-01	**8.656E-01**
	(0.5,0.5,0.5)	**3.118E-01**	2.789E-01	**4.538E-01**	1.972E-01	2.666E-01	**2.671E-01**
		2.565E-01	2.265E-01	**3.663E-01**	1.027E-01	**2.047E-01**	1.906E-01
		2.105E-01	1.333E-01	1.616E-02	**5.462E-02**	**1.375E-01**	1.232E-01

[41] T. T. Binh and U. Korn, "Mobes: A multiobjective evolution strategy for constrained optimization problems," in *The Third International Conference on Genetic Algorithms (Mendel 97)*, vol. 25. Citeseer, 1997, p. 27.

[42] M. Tanaka, H. Watanabe, Y. Furukawa, and T. Tanino, "Ga-based decision support system for multicriteria optimization," in *Systems, Man and Cybernetics, 1995. Intelligent Systems for the 21st Century., IEEE International Conference on*, vol. 2. IEEE, 1995, pp. 1556–1561.

[43] N. Srinvas and K. Deb, "Multi-objective function optimization using non-dominated sorting genetic algorithms," *Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 221–248, 1994.

[44] A. Osyczka and S. Kundu, "A new method to solve generalized multicriteria optimization problems using the simple genetic algorithm," *Structural optimization*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 94–99, 1995.

[45] H. Jain and K. Deb, "An Evolutionary Many-Objective Optimization Algorithm Using Reference-Point Based Nondominated Sorting Approach, Part II - Handling Constraints and Extending to an Adaptive Approach." *IEEE Trans. Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 602–622, 2014.

[46] D. A. Van Veldhuizen and G. B. Lamont, "Evolutionary computation and convergence to a pareto front," in *Late breaking papers at the genetic programming 1998 conference*. Citeseer, 1998, pp. 221–228.

[47] H. Li, Q. Zhang, and J. Deng, "Multiobjective test problems with complicated pareto fronts: Difficulties in degeneracy," in *Evolutionary Computation (CEC), 2014 IEEE Congress on*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 2156–2163.

[48] K. Li, K. Deb, Q. Zhang, and S. Kwong, "An evolutionary many-objective optimization algorithm based on dominance and decomposition," *Evolutionary Computation, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 694–716, 2015.

[49] K. Deb and H. Jain, "An evolutionary many-objective optimization algorithm using reference-point-based nondominated sorting approach, part i: Solving problems with box constraints," *Evolutionary Computation, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 577–601, 2014.

[50] H. Jain and K. Deb, "An evolutionary many-objective optimization algorithm using reference-point based nondominated sorting approach,

TABLE VII
BEST, MEDIAN AND WORST HV VALUES OBTAINED BY CMOEA/DD AND CNSGA-III ON M-OBJECTIVE DAC-MAOP7-9. BEST PERFORMANCE IS HIGHLIGHTED IN BOLD FONT

Instance		DAC-MaOP7		DAC-MaOP8		DAC-MaOP9	
M	Difficulty Triplet (D)	CMOEA/DD	CNSGA-III	CMOEA/DD	CNSGA-III	CMOEA/DD	CNSGA-III
3	(0.5,0,0)	**5.272E-01**	4.184E-01	**4.354E-01**	3.416E-01	5.794E-01	**5.883E-01**
		5.051E-01	3.515E-01	**3.911E-01**	3.015E-01	5.589E-01	**5.761E-01**
		4.747E-01	2.714E-01	**3.545E-01**	2.664E-01	5.414E-01	**5.444E-01**
	(0,0.5,0)	**4.219E-01**	4.005E-01	**4.171E-01**	3.561E-01	3.819E-01	**3.903E-01**
		4.203E-01	3.690E-01	**3.988E-01**	2.987E-01	3.759E-01	**3.846E-01**
		4.182E-01	3.050E-01	**3.737E-01**	2.639E-01	3.706E-01	**3.741E-01**
	(0,0,0.5)	**5.740E-01**	4.618E-01	**4.604E-01**	3.366E-01	5.970E-01	**5.997E-01**
		5.581E-01	4.035E-01	**4.280E-01**	2.983E-01	5.885E-01	**5.938E-01**
		5.407E-01	3.513E-01	**4.002E-01**	2.714E-01	5.759E-01	**5.833E-01**
	(0.5,0.5,0.5)	**3.864E-01**	3.718E-01	**3.560E-01**	1.828E-01	3.539E-01	**3.706E-01**
		3.824E-01	2.510E-01	**2.951E-01**	1.089E-01	3.405E-01	**3.449E-01**
		3.754E-01	1.700E-01	**1.228E-01**	6.615E-02	**3.241E-01**	3.104E-01
5	(0.5,0,0)	**4.937E-01**	3.131E-01	**4.295E-01**	2.655E-01	4.943E-01	**5.228E-01**
		4.702E-01	2.670E-01	**4.061E-01**	2.337E-01	4.378E-01	**4.731E-01**
		4.409E-01	2.088E-01	**3.846E-01**	1.971E-01	3.932E-01	**4.265E-01**
	(0,0.5,0)	**5.016E-01**	4.699E-01	**4.965E-01**	3.997E-01	3.944E-01	**3.957E-01**
		5.000E-01	4.216E-01	**4.873E-01**	3.513E-01	**3.867E-01**	3.789E-01
		4.986E-01	3.406E-01	**4.654E-01**	2.957E-01	**3.785E-01**	3.519E-01
	(0,0,0.5)	**6.764E-01**	4.449E-01	**5.821E-01**	3.731E-01	**6.347E-01**	6.275E-01
		6.538E-01	4.011E-01	**5.420E-01**	3.588E-01	6.065E-01	**6.070E-01**
		6.333E-01	3.767E-01	**5.152E-01**	3.401E-01	**5.728E-01**	5.530E-01
	(0.5,0.5,0.5)	**4.237E-01**	2.985E-01	**3.656E-01**	1.929E-01	**2.986E-01**	2.714E-01
		4.011E-01	1.808E-01	**3.130E-01**	1.319E-01	**2.671E-01**	2.484E-01
		3.231E-01	7.803E-02	**1.707E-01**	5.838E-02	**2.293E-01**	1.948E-01
7	(0.5,0,0)	**5.089E-01**	2.877E-01	**5.024E-01**	2.848E-01	**4.762E-01**	4.243E-01
		5.074E-01	2.307E-01	**4.746E-01**	1.979E-01	**4.708E-01**	3.097E-01
		5.063E-01	1.707E-01	**4.690E-01**	1.371E-01	**4.639E-01**	1.590E-01
	(0,0.5,0)	**5.085E-01**	4.757E-01	**5.036E-01**	4.305E-01	**4.767E-01**	4.635E-01
		5.073E-01	4.432E-01	**4.756E-01**	3.966E-01	**4.709E-01**	4.194E-01
		5.059E-01	4.085E-01	**4.694E-01**	3.422E-01	**4.658E-01**	3.635E-01
	(0,0,0.5)	**6.893E-01**	4.420E-01	**6.186E-01**	3.976E-01	**7.650E-01**	7.383E-01
		6.712E-01	4.164E-01	**5.720E-01**	3.780E-01	**7.380E-01**	6.949E-01
		6.527E-01	3.944E-01	**5.384E-01**	3.597E-01	**7.056E-01**	6.607E-01
	(0.5,0.5,0.5)	**3.802E-01**	2.499E-01	**3.349E-01**	2.190E-01	**3.479E-01**	2.150E-01
		3.195E-01	1.685E-01	**2.242E-01**	1.423E-01	**2.317E-01**	1.396E-01
		2.374E-01	6.410E-02	**1.083E-01**	5.423E-02	6.657E-02	**6.681E-02**
10	(0.5,0,0)	**3.472E-01**	3.423E-01	**3.282E-01**	2.572E-01	2.520E-01	**3.442E-01**
		3.082E-01	2.237E-01	**2.433E-01**	1.995E-01	1.876E-01	**2.309E-01**
		2.367E-01	1.445E-01	1.289E-01	**1.354E-01**	1.154E-01	**1.272E-01**
	(0,0.5,0)	**4.937E-01**	4.837E-01	**4.895E-01**	4.749E-01	4.533E-01	**4.558E-01**
		4.544E-01	**4.670E-01**	**4.821E-01**	4.416E-01	4.149E-01	**4.385E-01**
		4.394E-01	4.315E-01	**4.670E-01**	4.136E-01	3.800E-01	**4.246E-01**
	(0,0,0.5)	**6.629E-01**	4.496E-01	**6.397E-01**	4.265E-01	7.280E-01	**7.765E-01**
		6.414E-01	4.185E-01	**5.905E-01**	3.724E-01	6.707E-01	**7.520E-01**
		6.184E-01	3.847E-01	**5.164E-01**	3.385E-01	6.064E-01	**7.288E-01**
	(0.5,0.5,0.5)	**3.009E-01**	2.502E-01	**2.465E-01**	2.229E-01	**3.942E-01**	1.582E-01
		2.416E-01	1.944E-01	1.478E-01	**1.485E-01**	**3.210E-01**	1.153E-01
		8.080E-02	**1.240E-01**	4.821E-02	**6.738E-02**	**2.841E-01**	4.113E-02

part ii: handling constraints and extending to an adaptive approach," *Evolutionary Computation, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 602–622, 2014.

[51] E. Zitzler and L. Thiele, "Multiobjective evolutionary algorithms: a comparative case study and the strength pareto approach," *evolutionary computation, IEEE transactions on*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 257–271, 1999.



Fig. 8. Parallel coordinates of nondominated solutions obtained by CMOEA/DD and CNSGA-III on DAC-MaOP1-7 and DAC-MaOP9 with different difficulty triplets. (a)-(d) DAC-MaOP1, $D = (0, 0.5, 0)$. (e)-(f) DAC-MaOP2, $D = (0, 0, 0.5)$. (g)-(j) DAC-MaOP3, $D = (0, 0, 0.5)$. (k)-(l) DAC-MaOP4, $D = (0, 0, 0.5)$. (m)-(r) DAC-MaOP5, $D = (0.5, 0.5, 0.5)$. (s)-(t) DAC-MaOP6, $D = (0, 0, 0.5)$. (u)-(v) DAC-MaOP7, $D = (0.5, 0, 0)$. (w)-(x) DAC-MaOP9, $D = (0.5, 0, 0)$.